



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,677	07/03/2001	Gregory Stuart Snider	10003302-1	1745

7590 03/14/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2155

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/898,677	SNIDER, GREGORY STUART
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Benjamin R. Bruckart	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 25-39 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 25-39 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-24 remain cancelled.

Claims 25-39 are pending.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

There are multiple references in the specification to URLs starting at page 2, line 16-18; page 3, line 14; page 7, line 14 and so on. Please correct these and the other URLs.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see the appeal brief, filed 1/27/06, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 25-39 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the finality and the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claims 25, 30, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,728,758 by Sato.

Regarding claim 25, an e-service system (Sato: col. 3, lines 14-20), comprising:

client machine that generates a request pertaining to a set of data (Sato: col. 2, lines 5-8) such that the request is specified using an agent communication language (ACL) (Sato: col. 2, lines 5-8) having a structured query language (SQL) as a constraint language (Sato: col. 2, lines 15-24);

a web server having an ACL interpreter that enables access to the data in response to the request (Sato: col. 2, lines 9-24).

Claim 26, 31 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,728,758 by Sato in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0028563 by Stutz.

Regarding claim 26, the Sato reference teaches the e-service system of claim 25. The Sato reference fails to teach the request has an XML syntax. The Stutz reference teaches a request having syntax of an extensible markup language (XML) (Stutz: page 8, para 49). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the e-service machine as taught by Sato to include XML syntax messages as taught by Stutz in order to make the messages platform independent (Stutz: page 8, para 49; first line).

Claim 27, 32 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,728,758 by Sato in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,763,496 by Hennings et al.

Regarding claim 27, the Sato reference teaches the e-service system of claim 25. The Sato reference fails to teach an ACL interpreter translates input into CGI script. The Hennings reference teaches an interpreter translates the request into an input to a common gateway interface (CGI) script (Henning: col. 4, lines 9-24). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the e-service machine as taught by Sato while employing an interpreter to input into a CGI script as taught by Hennings in order to handle incoming information requests and return the appropriate data to the client (Hennings: col. 4, lines 9-24).

Claim 28-29, 33-34 and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,728,758 by Sato in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0013051 by Nakada et al.

Regarding claim 28, the Sato reference teaches e-service system of claim 25. The Sato fails to teach a KQML agent communication language. The Nakada reference teaches an ACL is a knowledge query manipulation language (KQML) agent communication language (Nakada: page 7, para 89). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the e-service machine as taught by Sato while employing KQML as taught by Nakada in order to provide for communication among agents in a similar language (Nakada: page 7, para 89).

Regarding claim 29, the Sato reference teaches the e-service system of claim 25. The Sato reference fails to teach FIPA. The Nakada reference teaches an ACL is a foundation for intelligent physical agents (FIPA) agent communication language (Nakada: page 7, para 89). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the e-service machine as taught by Sato while employing FIPA as taught by Nakada in order to provide for communication among agents in a similar language (Nakada: page 7, para 89).

While the examiner understands the difference between an e-service system, a web-server for a system, and a method for e-service; the examiner equates these to the hardware and software in which the features of the invention are implemented. Therefore similar claims are rejected along the same grounds. The table below draws parallels between the claim trees.

25	30	35
26	31	36
27	32	37
28	33	38
29	34	39

Prior Art

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0152260 by Chen is a good 103(a) reference teaching everything except the SQL constraint but may have been commonly owned by HP.

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0205772 by Uszok: page 1, para 6 teaches claimed features of agents communicating with the claimed features.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R. Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155
brb

brb


SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER